IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA Alexandria Division

MALIBU MEDIA, LLC,)
Plaintiff,)
v.) No. 1:18-cv-54 (LMB/MSN)
TONY DEGRAND,)
Defendant.)

<u>ORDER</u>

Before the Court is the parties' Joint Motion to Seal Case [Dkt. No. 18], in which the parties request an Order "sealing the entire Court file herein, and/or redacting Defendant's name from all Court filings, case caption, and docket entries necessary to remove Defendant's identifying information." According to the parties, defendant's public identification in connection with this civil action, in which plaintiff alleges that defendant has infringed on plaintiff's copyright in various adult films, "could embolden persons with an ill purpose to use the allegations in the court file to put pressure upon the Defendant, or to place him under unwarranted scrutiny in future employment or social circumstance [d]ue to the content of the works he is alleged to have infringed upon." Mot. 2.

Although a district court "may, in its discretion, seal documents if the public's right of access is outweighed by competing interests,' the 'presumption' in such cases favors public access." Ashcraft v. Conoco, Inc., 218 F.3d 288, 302 (4th Cir. 2000); see also Stone v. Univ. of Md. Med. Sys. Corp., 855 F.2d 178, 182 (4th Cir. 1988) ("The public's right of access to judicial records and documents may be abrogated only in unusual circumstances."). Almost all civil litigation entails a claim that the defendant has committed some wrongful act, which may often be

embarrassing if made public. In terms of potential social stigma, the allegations advanced in this particular civil action are not qualitatively distinct from those contained in, for example, an employment discrimination lawsuit or a mortgage foreclosure action; however, it is not the usual practice of the judiciary to seal these cases when the parties resolve the dispute. Simply put, by choosing to resolve a dispute through the courts, a party has chosen to make the dispute public, and defendant here has not advanced a sufficiently compelling private interest to overcome the resulting presumption in favor of the public's right of access to judicial records. Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that the parties' Joint Motion [Dkt. No. 18] be and is DENIED.

The Clerk is directed to forward copies of this Order to counsel of record and to defendant, pro se.

Entered this 2 day of May, 2018.

Alexandria, Virginia

Leonie M. Brinkema

United States District Judge

ารที่ได้เราะบาง เป็นเปลี่ยนในสิทธิเทียง (เมื่อ คนาย และ กลีเกียน เป็น โดย เป็น เป็น เป็น เป็นได้การใช้เห็นผล เมื่อก

Appendiction as well the entire transfer and the section of the control of the first resemble to the control of the control of

i kirista orozonia adalarita sati protessa seli ali apportate e ali establica aliqualitati del casa distribi

l<mark>gitt sk</mark>ittler, strigje på tiller mer gar skola grad skitare i til etter le og fillet erlågge et gilleress

कर्मन अस्तर केरिया का इत्याच्याक । जनकेरण जामी, र जनकर्मन्यक जनके हैं किये के कार हो है हैं, ह्या कहाँ कहाँ कहाँ कहाँ कहाँ कहाँ हैं

A comparison of the comparison

医复数感染性 医水平 医水水溶液 医二氯 医糖尿硷 医乳头 医乳头虫 医乳头 经连续通过基金

and my or the later than

atentificação e a la formación de percente en esta diferencia de la compansión de destribución de de

าให้สาย และเพลง ผู้เป็นที่ และเหมือนตามแก้ และ โดยเมื่นที่ และหลัง และ เลยเล่นหน้ายยาที่เพื่นหมายความสาย เกลง

151

Leonie M. Brinkema United States District Judge